

HAPPENINGS

BEFORE AND AFTER

STATEN ISLAND

BECAME PART OF

GREATER NEW YORK

AS NOTED

BY

DAVID J. TYSEN

AT THE REQUEST OF A NUMBER OF CITIZENS
OF
STATEN ISLAND

1924

PUBLISHED BY

THE STATEN ISLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

AVERY ARCHITECTURAL AND FINE ARTS LIBRARY
GIFT OF SEYMOUR B. DURST OLD YORK LIBRARY

9809 - S.F.
60

HAPPENINGS

BEFORE AND AFTER

STATEN ISLAND

BECAME PART OF

GREATER NEW YORK

AS NOTED
BY
DAVID J. TYSEN
AT THE REQUEST OF A NUMBER OF CITIZENS
OF
STATEN ISLAND

1924

PUBLISHED BY
THE STATEN ISLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

0485176

F

127

.57

4362

1924g



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

The Chamber of Commerce, in presenting this History of important happenings to our beloved Staten Island—First will thank Mr. Tysen for doing this service to the Community, giving an inside view of the conception and consummation of much that doubtless otherwise would have been lost to the Public.

No one so well informed as Mr. Tysen to do this—as he was in many cases the inception, cause and principal actor in many of the important matters herein recorded.

Mr. Tysen has passed the allotted four score years, but still takes a lively interest in all public matters, especially those affecting his beloved native Island.

A. L. SCHWAB

PRESIDENT STATEN ISLAND
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE



THE COUNTY ROAD LAW

In the fall of (the year I cannot recall) I went to Elizabeth, New Jersey, to spend the week end with a friend. On Sunday morning he suggested that we take a ride—in the evening he invited some friends in for dinner, after dinner in conversation with a Lawyer, Mr. Julius Fay, speaking of my ride in the morning with my host, Mr. Oscar D. Kremm, remarked he was ashamed of the roads. I told him they were no worse than those of Staten Island. He stated that they were seeking a remedy and were holding meetings every week, at neighbors houses, to decide upon some plan, and at the last meeting they had decided to go to the legislature and ask for a law to compel each town to build at least one-half mile of macadam road each year. I told Mr. Fay that I thought he was on the wrong track, that I had given the matter of road improvement considerable thought, and had concluded that the Town was too small a unit to have control of road improvement; that in my county we had five towns, that you could start from Castleton Corners and go thence via Manor Road, Egbert Avenue, Saw-Mill Road to Egbertville, thence by Richmond Road to Richmond and from thence a little farther west to Giffords Lane, a little more than three miles all told, tapping all five towns—thus having five different constructions in that short distance. As each town would be a law to itself, one would build a road 12 feet wide, another 14 feet, another 16 feet, etc. One would build 4 inches depth of macadam another 6 inches and another 8 inches. One would build of trap rock and another of lime stone. One would top dress with fine stone as a binder and roll the road, and another would not; thus having a Crazy Quilt of road construction. Again, I said Staten Island about 16 miles long and on the south-east side are two towns Southfield and Westfield. If such a law was in force, Southfield would build its first half mile near Clifton, where the population is greatest and Westfield at Tottenville where the population is greatest and thus if they continue to build on the main roads connecting Tottenville and Clifton, they would build one mile a year and it would be 16 years before they had a completed roadway—that then the first miles would probably be out of repair, that there would always be contention as to the town rights—and responsibilities on roads between towns—and in fact interminable disputes and trouble. That the town was too small a unit for improved road building, the control should be by

County at least—with the right of the Board of Supervisors (in New Jersey the Board of Freeholders) to take entire charge, with the right to bond the County, employ a competent engineer, with the character of improvement stated in the Law, so that no section should get a different or more costly improvement than other sections.

Mr. Fay at once saw the weakness of his proposed manner of improvement and said that he saw the advantage of the County Road System, that it had never occurred to any of those who were acting with him in the matter, and he would bring it up at the next meeting, and he was sure it would be approved, for he said it was so obvious as to be sure of success. He thanked me for my suggestions; and said it was most fortunate that we had met, and he was sure the proposition would be approved, and they would go to the Legislature as soon as it convened and get such a law passed. He did. And the New Jersey County Road Law was passed and Mr. Fay sent me a copy.

I had intended to do the same, but meanwhile one of the Vanderbilts died and in taking the body from Clifton to the Moravian Cemetery, the family were disgusted by the condition of the Richmond Road—and shortly thereafter I understood they intended to build a fine road from Clifton to New Dorp and I understood Mr. George Vanderbilt acting for the family commenced buying land along the route to widen the Richmond Road—thus matters went on until one evening I received from Nathaniel Marsh, Supervisor of the Town of Southfield, a copy of a Law which Mr. James McNamee had had passed by the State Senate and which had been sent down to the Assembly and a copy had been sent to Mr. Marsh by Hon. Daniel T. Cornell, then Member of Assembly. This law by coincidence proposed to do what Mr. Fay's Committee intended to do in New Jersey. Compel each of the five towns of Richmond to build $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of macadam road each year.

With this situation confronting me, I could not wait longer for the Vanderbilt improvement, and so got in touch with Supervisor Marsh. I took with me the Copy of the Jersey Law which Mr. Fay had sent me. I went over the matter with Mr. Marsh, and requested him to ask the Supervisors and Assemblyman Cornell and Mr. McNamee to meet at his New York Office on the following Saturday afternoon, and that I would invite some substantial Citizens from different parts of the County to meet and go over the matter as it was of the very first importance to Richmond that no mistake should be made. Mr. Marsh willingly consented to do this: so the next Saturday afternoon the Supervisors and Assemblyman Cornell and about 15 prominent citizens including Mr. McNamee the sponsor of the law which had passed the Senate.

We organized the meeting by making Gen. Satterlee, Chairman and Edward P. Doyle, Supervisor of Northfield, Secretary. I explained to the meeting the object of the call and went over the ground practically the same as I did with Mr. Fay, and read to them the Jersey County Road Law, that New Jersey was then operating under, in improving the highways and showed them that Mr. McNamee's bill would do just what New Jersey had steered clear of.

Every one in the room seemed pleased with the proposition except Mr. McNamee who said his Bill had passed the Senate, and he was assured it would pass the Assembly, and our substitute was too radically ultra and the people would not stand for such drastic change, etc. Mr. McNamee was alone in this contention. The result was that a Committee of three, Mr. George J. Greenfield, Mr. David Wilcox and Mr. McNamee were appointed a Committee to draft a County Road Law similar to the New Jersey Law; and report to a meeting to be held at the same place the next Saturday afternoon. Unfortunately, Mr. Wilcox had to go to Washington on important business, and Mr. McNamee somewhat disgruntled refused to assist in drafting the law, and Mr. Greenfield asked me to assist him. He had already prepared a tentative draft, which we altered only by putting in a provision to protect the rural sections of the County, by a Clause which provided that all roads costing at the rate of more than ten thousand dollars per mile; the excess should be paid by the town or village in which such road was located.

We met pursuant to adjournment at the same place the following Saturday, with a full attendance, for all saw the importance of action. Mr. Greenfield read his proposed bill, and as before all were heartily in favor, except Mr. McNamee. After much discussion he said he would take it home and think it over, at once there were objections to delay, and many were so persistent against delay, some saying we could wait and give him all the time he wanted to consider it, seeing we were determined he took the draft aside and after spending a few minutes he said he would like a change of two or three words. The change was left to Mr. Greenfield, who decided it would not affect the draft, and so the County Road Law as now finally enacted was approved by the meeting unanimously and a committee consisting of George J. Greenfield, Henry T. Metcalf, James McNamee, I. K. Martin, David J. Tysen and Mr. Eugene Outerbridge was appointed.

The Committee was instructed to co-operate with Assemblyman Cornell and have the County Road Bill as proposed substituted for the McNamee Bill which had passed the Senate. The Committee all went to Albany the next Monday morning, and arranged with Mr. Cornell's help to have the County Road Bill as prepared, substituted for the McNamee Bill. We then paid our

respects to Gov. David B. Hill, and went over the matter with him; told him how important it was to us, and got his promise to help us by signing the Bill if when it came to him there were no constitutional grounds to object. The Bill was passed as prepared by Mr. Greenfield, and in due time signed by the Governor, and thus the greatest boon of all improvements before or since came to Richmond.

When the Bill became a law the supervisors got busy immediately, and voted to bond the county for \$100,000 to begin with, and road improvement commenced and when we went into the City of New York most of our important highways were improved and had it not been for the County Road Law—we would have been stuck in the mud until this day—for much of the property of the rural sections, outside of the villages would not have been able to stand assessment under the City; it would have in many cases amounted virtually to confiscation, and without our road improvement, growth in population would have been impossible and there would have been no advancement so it is no exaggeration to say that if it had not been for the County Road Law, we would be stuck in the mud—in most of the County—to this day.

THE SOUTHFIELD BOULEVARD

In going over my father's papers, I came across a petition which he had prepared in 1841, for a public road, 50 feet wide along the southside of the Island, about where the Boulevard is now located. That petition had several names of land owners who had agreed to give their lands for such a road, but others refusing my father became disgusted, and abandoned the enterprise.

I had long known the great need of a road in this section, as there was no public highway between the Richmond and the Amboy Roads, and the beach or bay for many miles, which made connection between neighbors and towns very circuitous. So after mature deliberation, with a full comprehension of the rebuffs, disappointments, and difficulties I would meet I determined to promote the construction of a wide road, through this arear. My idea was to begin at the Finger-board Road, so the first man I called upon was Mr. Cameron. Mr. Cameron was very decided against such a road through his property. He would not have a public highway dividing his farm and homestead, he was so pronounced in his opposition that I did not trouble him again; for the success of my project depended largely upon getting lands donated for the road. The next owner I called upon was David Runph, who owned a farm on the Old Town Road, which he used for market gardening. I was prepared for

opposition from him, for it was no trifling matter in those days to ask a farmer to give a roadway through a farm, necessitating fencing and disarranging his field lay out, so I was not disappointed when I proposed to him to give land the entire length of his farm for a 100 foot road. He said you don't think I am crazy to do such a foolish thing, besides what do you want of a 100 foot road 50 feet is wide enough. So after some more talk I passed him for the time being. I had already signed the petition giving the 100 feet through my several farms amounting together to about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles. The next owner I called upon was Mr. L. E. Seaver—who represented his mother and family as owners of a large farm—between Dongan Hills and Grant City—after several very satisfactory conferences I received the promise of the necessary land 100 feet wide through their farm.

The next man I encountered was Mr. Cornelius Cole, who owned quite a stretch along the line I desired to build the road. He also thought it was foolish to build such a wide road, thought 40 or 50 feet in width was ample, that a road 100 feet besides taking much unnecessary land would be more expensive to make, and more expensive to keep in repair, that he would give for the road 50 feet wide; if it was laid out in front of his house (where the Boulevard now runs) but that he would not have a road cutting his farm at the back of his house.

The next party was another Mr. Cole a relative of the former Mr. Cole, who had no very clear idea of the road or its advantages, but said he would do what his neighbors did. The next one approached was Mr. John J. Croke, one of the best and most progressive citizens, who had made a large fortune in New York City, and lost it in silver mining in the West. He met me in the most friendly spirit, and said he would not object giving land for a 100 foot boulevard, but that he would like to have it go through the middle of his farm or homestead, a little south of his residence. This I knew was impossible for Mr. Cornelius Cole, who was a most determined and decided character had absolutely refused to let it go back of his house. So I went along down the line and after interviewing some rather small owners with various success or rebuffs—I called on Mr. David Bennett King, who was trustee for creditors of Erastus Wiman. Mr. King who from the first was much interested in the proposed Boulevard, and in fact took a very intelligent interest in all matters affecting the Island, very willingly consented to give the land 100 feet wide if it was laid out straight through his land—but as a conscientious trustee, he doubted whether he would be justified to give the land if the boulevard was run diagonally through the Wiman property. The next party seen, was Mr. Robinson, who owned a large farm adjoining the Erastus Wiman property. Mr. Robinson also a Public Spirited Citizen,

thought the Boulevard would be a good improvement, but wanted it to go straight and not diagonally through his property. The next owner was Major Clarence F. Barrett. Mr. Barrett who had had large experience as a landscape architect immediately approved of the project, and said he would give 100 or 125 feet. Put it as near the centre of his place as I could, but take it any where necessary. The next was a Mr. Roberts who resided in Brooklyn and had his Country residence along the southwest side of the Eltingville Road (Seaside Avenue) running from near the Amboy Road down to the Fishing Club property, a distance of nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ mile. When approached about giving 100 feet for a boulevard he was indignant. He would have no public highway dividing his property, that was his private country home and he wanted it private, etc., etc. So that was the situation in the beginning, not a very encouraging outlook, but I was not daunted. I had a hard task ahead, but there was no credit in doing as easy thing, and so I worked on these men, first one and then the other for two years, never relinquishing my efforts, many nights out till nearly midnight, until Mrs. Tysen became discouraged and thought it would be loves labor lost; for she said everyone said I could not succeed. I kept pegging away always hoping and sometimes making gains, and knowing first that I could not get through Cameron, without a fight, which was out of the question—second, that I could not persuade Mr. Cole to change his determination not to have it go back of his house, and also that it would be impossible to get through Roberts without a legal struggle. I eliminated these obstructions from my efforts.

After many talks with Mr. King, high minded and public spirited citizen, I succeeded in satisfying him to cut the Wiman property somewhat on the diagonal, while not as beneficial as where he desired the road to run, that it would greatly enhance the value of his property, when once he could see it in that light he consented with alacrity, and this made it easier to treat with Mr. Robinson, whom I finally prevailed upon to allow the Boulevard to go somewhat diagonally through his farm. This was necessary in order to meet a narrow road between Robert's property and the Fishing Club property, as it was the only way to get to the Woods of Arden and so on to the Westfield line; for I knew if I had to have enough land condemned from the Robert's property to widen this road to 100 feet the damages would be trivial, so Mr. King's acquiescence was the key to the situation at this end of the route, as David Rumph was at the other end and he was a hard nut to crack. I used the influence of many of Rumph's friends but with little success, and finally one night I had a long talk with him, stated he was the only one standing in the way of success and finally I agreed to have two ponds on his farm filled up, that I knew and appreciated its importance, as I

had given so much of my property and had spent so much time, that I felt it would be an outrage to have it fail, and that he could not afford to incur the displeasure of so many of his neighbors by laying himself across the path and preventing this much needed improvement and so I finally got his reluctant promise to give the land necessary. This practically ended my endeavors in this direction, but right here I was confronted by another and very serious situation. The supervisors had been so active in selling County Bonds and building County Roads that they had about reached the Bonding Limit of the County, which was 10 per cent. of the assessed valuation, so I had to cast about to get the necessary funds to improve the Boulevard, and condemn some small lots along the line.

BONDING THE TOWNS

I concluded to try to get the towns to bond for road improvement. I made a call at the Town Board of Middletown, which was my home town, at their first meeting, told them the object of my mission and was met by the statement from the Supervisor Dr. John L. Feeny, Chairman of the Board, that that was impossible as Mr. Sidney F. Rawson, their Counsel, who was also Counsel for the Town Board of Northfield, had given the latter town board an opinion that all bonds issued at this time would be a charge upon the town issuing them. This surprised me, and I told Dr. Feeny I was sure Mr. Rawson was wrong, that I was familiar with the charter in this matter, but if they would make an adjournment for a couple of days I would get an opinion from Mr. George J. Greenfield, who was on the Charter Commission. The board consented to do this and adjourned for a couple of days. The next day I called upon Mr. Greenfield, told him of Rawson's opinion, which was holding up important improvements and he was astonished, said Rawson was wrong, and if he had looked into the matter he knew better. I asked him to give me a short and emphatic opinion on the matter of liability for the bonds, which he did, stating in a few words, that all bonds issued before consolidation, whether of School, Village, Town or County, if legally issued, became a charge upon the City, the City taking the property, and assuming the responsibility. This opinion I took to the Town Board at the time to which they had adjourned, they were all pleased with the opinion, as they all saw the value of the improvements sought, but Mr. Feeny said while he was inclined to agree with Mr. Greenfield and myself, he could not see what they could do, except to have the matter tested in the Courts or get another Counsel. I told him I thought it better to ask Mr. Rawson for a written opinion as I was quite sure he had not taken much interest in the matter, and

that he was too good a lawyer to go upon record for what seemed to me an unwarranted position. This they agreed to do and while I was there they passed a Resolution asking Mr. Rawson for a written opinion (to be delivered as soon as possible) on this point, and enclosed it with a copy of Greenfield's opinion and dispatched a messenger with it without delay. The next morning (Mr. Greenfield later told me) Mr. Rawson stopped at Mr. Greenfield's office which was on Broadway near his own office, and said to Mr. Greenfield, "Counsellor it seems we differ upon the Construction of the Charter." Greenfield answered there is no room for difference in the construction, for the Charter is very plain upon that point, and you are too good a lawyer to subscribe to any such ridiculous view. Rawson laughed, went out and in the afternoon sent around to Mr. Greenfield's office a copy of the opinion which he had prepared and a foot note by way of pleasantry in pencil. "What does the Honorable Court think of the opinion?" Mr. Greenfield wrote under it: "The Court agrees with the learned Counsel." The opinion reached the Town Board that day and at the meeting of the following day the Town Board voted to Bond the Town to the legal limit for money for road improvement.

Mr. Marsh, Supervisor of Southfield—the Town in which the Boulevard was located—was extra careful in his procedure, fearing if peradventure any mistakes were made the officers of the Town might be responsible, preferred before acting, to have a Town Meeting to consider the matter, so I got him to call the Town Meeting at the large hall at Bachman's Brewery, and I immediately interested several citizens who were interested in the matter to canvass the town and get out as large a number of taxpayers as possible for I was sure upon a good understanding, the meeting would approve of the sale of the Bonds. I sought the aid of Hon. Daniel T. Cornell, and Mr. Robert W. Nelson, an able and forceful man residing at Giffords to be present to aid me if any serious opposition arose, but on arriving at the Hall which was quite well filled, we found general unanimity, in favor of the bonding, as all had become quite well informed upon the matter. Mr. Marsh as Supervisor of the Town, presided, stated the object of the meeting and I offered the resolution, that it was the sense of the meeting to bond the town to the limit for road improvement and ordered the town board to take such action. The resolution was passed unanimously—seeing everything favorable I thought it a good time to settle the disposition of the money resulting from the sale, which as I remember, would be about \$300,000. I offered a resolution that \$120,000 of this money should go for the improvement of the Southfield Boulevard, and the balance to be spent in improving such highways in the town as the Highway Commissioners of the Town desig-

nated, with the improvement to be under the Control of the Board of Supervisors, as under the County Road Law, and the supervision of the work to be by the County Road Engineer, who was Henry P. Morrison. This passed unanimously. The other towns got into line and followed suit. And thus we got \$800,000 of good road improvement, which at this time would cost at least \$2,000,000—which we would not have had if some one had not persisted in urging the Bonding of the Towns. This fairly well completed the net work of all the important roads of the County.

GREATER NEW YORK

The first I learned of Andrew H. Green's plan of consolidation for a Greater City was through the Press. The area as stated in the published newspapers did not include Staten Island. This I deemed a mistake for many reasons, and so I determined to call upon Mr. Green—who was rightly termed (Father of Greater New York) I knew Mr. Green very well back from the days when he and Fred Law Olmstead (who lived on Staten Island on the shore near Eltingville) planned the Central Park, so I made my way to Mr. Green's office on Broadway, Manhattan, and on entering after greetings he pointed to the map of proposed Greater New York hanging on the wall, I did not enthuse very much and he exclaimed apparently somewhat disappointed: "Why don't you approve?" I said: "Yes, but you have left out the best part." "What do you mean Staten Island?" And at that moment before discussion had commenced Col. Waring came in and after greetings Mr. Green turned to Col. Waring and said: "Mr. Tysen thinks we should have taken Staten Island into the proposed Greater City." "Ha, Ha, Staten Island is too far down the Bay," exclaimed the Colonel—"about 50 years hence, when you have much larger population, and much fewer mosquitoes you may consistently ask to be included in the City—Ha, Ha, Ha." The Colonel stayed but a few minutes, and when he left I told Mr. Green that the including Staten Island in the proposed Greater City was what I came to see him about, and so the discussion commenced. Mr. Green deeply interested in his plan, and anxious to make no mistake was a very attentive listener while I recounted the many advantages Staten Island would bring to the Greater City. After quite a long talk, Mr. Green thanked me for calling and said I had opened up to him important matters connected with consolidation, which gave him food for thought, and said he intended to go over the matter thoroughly, and asked me to call again in a few days. When I called as I entered his office he pointed with much enthusiasm to his map of Greater New York with Staten Island taken in, naturally I felt much pleased. In a short time the public became

aware of the change in the scope of the plan, and there was much opposition on the Island to becoming a part of the Greater City. In a short time consolidation was submitted to a vote of the people of the territory to be included. There were two sides to the question—and naturally I felt anxious about the result of the referendum. I took an active part in favor of going into the city—acting with Dr. Eccleston of St. John's Church—Hon. Daniel T. Cornell—Robert W. Nelson—Henry T. Metcalfe—Charles Griffith—Jacob Houseman—General Satterlee—I. K. Martin—Judge Benedict and others. We made a lively canvass with the result that Richmond County gave a larger majority in favor of consolidation (proportioned to its population) than any other of the Civic sections included in the proposed Greater City. Consolidation was approved by a large majority and Greater New York was born. Immediately important questions affecting the Greater City forced attention upon the residents and taxpayers. Among others was the question of better ferry facilities, between Staten Island and Manhattan. The franchise for the Staten Island and New York Ferry was shortly to terminate and a struggle for control cropped out, with the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad owners of the ferry boats and the Staten Island Rapid Transit on the one side and H. H. Rogers owner of the Midland Trolley System on the other. Our experience with the Baltimore and Ohio had not been very re-assuring—they being very long of promises and very short of performances—the people generally took sides with the Roger's interest.

Mayor Low who was deeply interested in the welfare of Staten Island invited a delegation of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce to meet him at his home to discuss the ferry question. The Chamber accepted and a large committee of the Chamber headed by Mr. Gaugy Irving, Chairman and Cornelius G. Kolff, Secretary had a most satisfactory discussion upon the ferry question, and found the Mayor deeply interested, and at his suggestion a committee of three of the Chamber were named for future conferences. The Chamber named Mr. Irving, Mr. George J. Greenfield and David J. Tysen as such Committee and said Committee remained in active participation during the whole of the future contest over the ferry.

The Committee soon got into communication with Mr. Rogers and found him desirous and willing to do a fair thing for Staten Island in giving it better ferry facilities. After several meetings upon which the ferry question was freely discussed in all its branches, we got Mr. Roger to agree practically to all our requests—which included building five new large boats—making the trip in 20 minutes a 3 cent fare—and the building of new suitable ferry buildings at both St. George at foot of Arrietta Street and South Ferry, New York.

Numerous meetings were held pursuant to the call of the Committee, in different places (mostly along the easterly shore of the Island—from Clifton to Port Richmond) and the citizens seemed quite unanimous in favor of the Rogers proposition which included a new terminal at the foot of Arrietta Street and a ferry to Port Richmond. The only serious opposition came from the Staten Island Club at St. George, where the Manager of the Baltimore & Ohio and Russell Bleeker, Secretary of the Dock Commissioner made their headquarters—and these two, very active in support of the Old Ferry Company seemed to dominate the Staten Island Club. Thus matters went on until one evening I got a phone message to the effect that the Dock Commissioner would like to meet our Committee at the Staten Island Club at 8 o'clock that evening and that notice had been sent to Mr. Greenfield and Mr. Irving. I agreed to be there. On arriving at the Club I found Mr. Irving and Mr. Greenfield present, and after waiting for Mr. Careere and Mr. Davenport to finish their dinner we were invited by the President of the Club, Mr. Careere, to their directors room upstairs. Instead of the Dock Commissioner, his assistant was present. So we were seated around the directors' table, and Mr. Davenport arose and stated we were present largely at his request which was occasioned by a meeting with the Dock Commissioner, who handed him what he called (after reading) the ultimatum of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. He expatiated long and eloquently about the great Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and said the interest of Staten Island would be best served by accepting their proposals, etc. This led to a somewhat acrimonious debate, which ended without result and the efforts of our worthy friends of the Staten Island Club were abortive. A few days after this meeting, Mr. Careere came to me on the ferry boat and said I was making a mistake to oppose the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and Baltimore & Ohio, that it would be impossible to defeat the two large corporations with their great influence, etc., etc. Thus matters went on without much change in favor of either party to the controversy—until one evening Mr. Gaugy Irving of the Committee and Mr. Cornelius G. Kolff called at my house. Mr. Irving had with him a printed phamplet,—the recommendation of a Franchise to the Baltimore & Ohio R. R. the then occupants and operators of the ferry offering much better terms than ever before—including the building of 3 new boats, and putting in good condition 2 or 3 of the old boats—to make the trip in 25 minutes and 5 cent fare, and some reduction on fares for teams and pay to the City the present rentals for the slips at St. George and Manhattan, etc.—but did not offer a 3 cent fare—as per Rogers offer. This offer being as Mr. Irving said so good and near to the Rogers offer, that it would be hard to get the City to change and put the Baltimore & Ohio

out. Mr. Irving was much perturbed, and fearful that we would loose our main contention for the 3 cent fare. We spent the evening talking over the matter and I assured Mr. Irving the battle was not yet lost and asked him to leave me the printed recommendation of McDougal Hawks, Dock Commissioner—the lease and franchise of the ferry to the Baltimore and Ohio.

The meeting of the Board of Sinking Fund Commission was called for the next day at 10 o'clock at the City Hall and after requesting my visitors to get as many there as possible. I took to the study of the proposed lease—I found ear marks that the lease had been prepared by an astute corporation lawyer in the interest of the Baltimore and Ohio R. R. and not in the interest of the City of New York or the Borough of Richmond. I found many things objectionable in the proposed lease—but fearing the influence of the Railroad and political influence of the Dock Commissioner, who was appointed on recommendation of Senator Platt I concluded to do what I had long considered the best—to strike over the whole contention for a municipally owned and operated ferry. Having acted with Mr. Rogers so far in the ferry matter, and having been met by him in a fair and liberal spirit, I deemed it but fair I should advise him of the determination to ask for a Municipal Ferry. Knowing that Mr. Rogers generally got to his office quite early I took an early boat in order to see him before going to the meeting. Mr. Rogers was punctual as usual and I had his ear immediately and he at once acquiesced in the Municipal Ferry proposition as he stated that he personally was only concerned in securing a good approach to the ferry for his Railroad and did not want to be shut out by his competitors who were, as he stated acting selfish and mean,—so the meeting came on and the McDougal Hawk's proposed lease was read and discussed and vigorously supported by Mr. Boardman of Tracy, Boardman & Platt—and I was introduced as the Representative of the Chamber of Commerce by its Chairman, Mr. Irving to speak in opposition. I began by claiming that it was an outrage to compel the people of Richmond to pay rent for the terminals, especially at South Ferry, to pay I said for putting our feet on the soil of Manhattan. I paid my respects to the Dock Commissioner and criticized the proposed lease, showing that in many respects especially in the building of three boats only instead of five and the asking for a 5 cent fare instead of 3 cents offered by Mr. Rogers, and on I think 14 different points I claimed the proposed lease was defective in protecting the interest of the people and then to the consternation of everyone present I launched my demand for a Municipal Ferry—immediately I was asked to desist by Mr. Edward Lauterbach, Attorney for Mr. Rogers and Mr. Allen the Confidential Agent of Mr. Rogers—but when I told them I had seen Mr. Rogers and

he acquiesced they ceased opposition—and I went on with my argument that it was the City's duty to furnish us a good connection with the other Boroughs and since the ferry was our only connection it was their bounden duty to furnish us the best ferry possible. That when we consider the vast amount the City has spent in bridges and tunnels to connect the other boroughs and give them a five cent fare practically from the limits of each of the 4 Boroughs to the limits of the others—and that, Richmond was paying as much if not more than the other Boroughs and they get the benefits for all these great improvements and we didn't, it would be a burlesque upon justice to deny to Richmond the cost of a good ferry.

What I asked has Brooklyn and Queens, Manhattan or Bronx to say against this proposition, when the people of Richmond are taxed to pay as much if not more on every dollar of assessment for all the facilities furnished by the City at great expense—what in justice have they against giving this comparatively small amount to Richmond. This and many other arguments, which since have become quite hackeneyed were shot at the Board. The Board seemed interested paying strict attention—and then when I charged that the proposed lease was the work of an astute Corporation Lawyer and in the interest of the Baltimore & Ohio R. R. and not in the interests of New York or the Borough of Richmond the controller asked McDougal Hawks, the Dock Commissioner, if the Corporation Counsel had approved the proposed lease, and Hawks said he had sent him a copy. Has he approved it insisted Mr. Grout, and Hawks had to say: "No." "Then you should not have presented it here". Their plumes dropped—the handwriting was on the wall, they were whipped: the hearing was closed, among the many who congratulated me was Henry P. Morrison, who came beaming, saying: "they have met their Waterloo and I congratulate you upon the victory". I was not so sanguine of victory, knowing the tenacity of soulless corporations, but he was right—for nothing more was ever heard of the lease to the Baltimore & Ohio R. R. In the hall after the hearing I met the Mayor and he asked me to call at his office the next afternoon—I went, and was received very cordially by the Mayor, who said he had been much interested in my argument the day before, and said I could count on getting free terminals both at St. George and at South Ferry and that he would do his best to give us a good ferry, but he thought the City was not prepared to embark upon Municipal ownership, and operation of the Ferry—I asked him why? He said: "Judging from intimations dropped by the Controller, who lived in Brooklyn, that Borough would be very strongly opposed to Municipal ownership and operation of the ferry—that every ferry in Brooklyn was being operated at a loss—their earnings having been seriously impaired

by the bridges and tunnels, and that if the City should take over the Staten Island Ferry every Ferry Company in Brooklyn would strike to have the City relieve them of their burden. I remember I became quite indignant that Brooklyn should take this selfish stand, and came back with the statement that that position was ridiculous, because Brooklyn had received much better facilities in bridges and tunnels as City charge, it was a far cry for them to oppose a good ferry to Staten Island. Give us bridges and tunnels and we will let the ferry take care of itself, and much more along the same lines. When Mayor Low turned to me and said those arguments are unanswerable, and I will support the Municipal proposition, if after a fair trial, we cannot get the two contending parties to agree to work together and give us a good ferry such as I think the City should provide for Staten Island. I think it but fair to give them a fair chance, etc. I told him I was sure they would not come together, but a trial could do no harm. We talked over the best way of procedure to accomplish this result, and the Mayor thought it best to have a committee of three of the Sinking Fund Commission to consider and report on the Staten Island Ferry. I told him I thought that would be a mistake. That it would be much better for him to ask to be appointed a Committee of one to consider and report on the Ferry matters, as with a Committee of one there could be no disagreement, and no jealousy and the people of Staten Island would be pleased to have the matter in his hands—and after discussion he concluded he would ask to be made a committee of one on the Staten Island Ferry—at the next meeting he was appointed a Committee of one on the Staten Island Ferry to report at an early meeting of the board. The Mayor requested me to call again in a few days as he thought he would like some information on several points. I called and found that he had prepared what he termed a tentative report—which upon reading I found liberal, just and fair. I did not suggest any change, but a few additions—I told him of the lack of overhead space in the team gangways of the old boats, that teams coming down loaded too high were not allowed to go aboard—that a man with a measuring rod stood ready to measure the height of loads, etc., and this was a great handicap and injury to the Island, that the team passage ways were some four feet less in height than those of the Pennsylvania R. R. ferries—also that I thought it wise to include in his report that boats and slips should be built to take passengers at both decks, as this would facilitate loading and unloading and save much time, and that this was especially important as there were only two slips at the South Ferry available for the Staten Island business—and that double deck loading and unloading would largely increase the capacity and value of the slips.

The Mayor agreed with me that it would be wise to include these two suggestions in his report—at an early meeting of the Sinking Fund Commission the Mayor's report was unanimously adopted.

The following is a copy of the Mayor's report:

April 1, 1903.

TO THE HONORABLE THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE SINKING FUND:

On the 19th of March I received from Mr. C. S. Sims, Vice-President of the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company, the letter which is hereto attached. By this communication the company offers to "convey the property in question at St. George (857 feet of water front) for the consideration named in our communication to the Commissioner of Docks and Ferries dated February 9, 1903, which consideration, we understand, has already been approved by the Comptroller's appraiser, subject, before making conveyance, to the following conditions."

The conditions are important, if a lease were to be made with either railroad company on the lines that have been heretofore under discussion. I think, however, that the letter justified the City in assuming that it can command the ownership of the terminals at both ends of the Staten Island Ferry and that the City is now, therefore, for the first time, in a position to consider what sort of a lease it desires to make, in view of all the circumstances of the case and without particular regard to the terms that have heretofore been offered.

Taking up the question from this point of view, the first thing to be remembered is that the lease now to be made is to run for twenty-five years. It is not too much to say that a lease running for this length of time will determine the destiny of the Borough of Richmond for the whole quarter of a century. I am of the opinion, therefore, that The City of New York should now say what sort of a ferry service Staten Island ought to have, and that whatever lease the City makes should be conditioned upon the giving of such service. When it is considered that every other borough of the City is soon to receive the benefit of vast outlays for municipal subways and for bridges built at the public expense, I think that is a matter of the utmost importance to secure for the Borough of Richmond substantially as good service by ferry, in point of frequency of trips as is now given by the ferries between Manhattan and Brooklyn, and, in point of fares, the rates now prevailing upon the Brooklyn Bridge; that is to say, for passengers the rates upon the bridge railroad, and for vehicles the rates upon the bridge company. In other words, in

my judgment, there ought to be during all the busy hours of the twenty-four a ferry service to St. George every ten minutes, so that Staten Islanders need not be compelled to consult a timetable. The fare on the Brooklyn Bridge railroad is 3 cents, with ten tickets for 25 cents. The rates for vehicles on the bridge roadway range from 3 cents for a single horse, led, to 10 cents for a pair of horses or an automobile. There should also be freight ferries to Stapleton and Port Richmond, running as often as may be necessary, and with low fares.

It would be the height of folly, it seems to me, to enter upon a twenty-five year lease with the expectation that any of the boats in the present service, except the "Robert Garrett" and the "Castleton", should be used for a day longer than is necessary to replace them. The "Robert Garrett" and the "Castleton" should be rebuilt so as to provide as much headroom for vehicles as the Pennsylvania Railroad ferry boats on the North River. At the present time, I am told, the upper decks of these boats are some four feet lower than the Pennsylvania Railroad standard. These boats, also, should be modernized in every respect. I estimate that six new boats, of the best pattern, will be necessary to give the service that seems to me called for.

If these premises are accepted as sound, several conclusions follow inevitably:

A. That with such a ferry service the increase of population upon the island will be very rapid, and consequently that the assessed value of the Borough will similarly increase.

B. That, in particular, both of the railroad companies interested in transit upon Staten Island will profit greatly from such service; (1) because of the increase of travel, coming from Staten Island's growth in population; (2) because of the development of the island, for business purposes, certain to follow a modernized ferry service that gives to the island both frequency of trips and low rates of fare; and (3) because of the increase in the value of their real estate, of which both companies own a great deal.

C. That both the City and the railroad companies, being all interested in bringing about these results, should co-operate in making such a ferry service possible.

It must be assumed, I suppose, that during the first few years of such a ferry service the expense account will outrun the income. I think it may be taken for granted, however, that within ten years, and, perhaps, in a much shorter period a ferry giving such service will meet its running expenses, including all necessary charges, and interest on the cost of the new boats, and provision for a sinking fund to liquidate the bonds issued for their purchase.

I submit herewith, therefore, an outline of the essential terms of a proposed lease, based upon these ideas. This lease contemplates the formation of an operating company, by both of the railroads, concerned, which shall not be expected to pay dividends, but whose expense and income account shall be balanced every year. It contemplates the expenditure by the City of \$925,000, more or less, for the purchase and improvement of terminals, including terminals at Stapleton and Port Richmond, and that the City shall waive any charge for interest upon this outlay, or for the use of slips, or for the franchise privileges, until it is earned by the ferry. On the other hand, it contemplates the payment to the City, by each railroad company, of $\frac{1}{2}$ c. for each passenger carried to or from the ferry at St. George. This payment is to be made without any regard to the outcome of running the ferry; but if at the end of any year there is a deficiency on account of the operation of the ferry, one-third of the deficiency may be deducted from this sum, and the remainder of the deficiency is to be borne equally by the two railroad companies. The lease also contemplates that when the ferry company earns a profit—as it is likely to do long before the expiration of the lease—the profits shall be used, first of all, to make good any of the deficiencies which have been thus incurred, and, afterwards, that the profits shall go to the City, as payment on account of rents, slips and franchise.

The terms of the proposed lease, herewith submitted, are expressed in layman's phrase, but the Corporation Counsel informs me that such a lease can easily be put in legal form, if this Board approves the plan, and the railroads, whose co-operation is necessary, will agree to co-operate.

The railroads on Staten Island last year collected, together, about thirteen million single fares. Of this number, I estimate that six millions were fares of passengers going to and from the ferry. On this basis, the contribution asked for from the railroads is a little less than $\frac{1}{4}$ c. per fare, taking the local and ferry travel together. It is apparent, also, that the growth of population on Staten Island certain to follow upon such a ferry service will increase the local business of these roads quite as much as it will the ferry business, and probably more. I believe, therefore, that the proposition is essentially a just one, and that the railroads should not hesitate to accept it, in consideration of the fact that the City proposes to make an out-lay of nearly a million dollars in order to improve the terminal facilities, and also to waive, until it is earned, the payment of a sum for rent and franchise that may fairly be estimated at \$75,000 a year, even at the low rates at which the City borrows money.

It goes without saying that the terminal arrangements at St. George must be made in such a way as to be just to both railroad

companies; and it will be perceived that if either one secures a larger proportion of the travel than the other, that one, in paying $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per passenger, will pay to the City proportionately more than the other. In other words, each railroad will pay for access to the ferry in proportion to the number of passengers that it carries to and fro.

If the Board of Sinking Fund Commissioners approves of this proposition I suggest that the matter be referred back to the Dock Commissioner, in connection with the Mayor, for the negotiation of a lease as nearly as possible on the line indicated.

SETH LOW, Mayor.

Proposed plan for a lease of the Staten Island ferry, Upon the Assumption that the City owns the Terminals at both ends.

The City wants—

1. A ferry to St. George.
2. A freight ferry to Stapleton.
3. A freight ferry to Port Richmond.

1. As to St. George: Between Whitehall and St. George the City wants trips every ten minutes, from 6 a. m., to 7.30 p. m.; from 7.30 p. m. to 1 a. m., trips every half hour; from 1 a. m. to 6 a. m. trips every hour.

Between Whitehall and St. George the passenger fares to be charged upon the ferry to be those now prevailing on the railroad on the Brooklyn Bridge, viz:

Single fares for passengers (10 tickets to be sold for 25 cents).....	3 cents
--	---------

For vehicles, etc., the rates prevailing on the Brooklyn Bridge roadway:

Single horse, led.....	3 cents
Single horse and wagon.....	5 cents
Teams	10 cents
Automobiles of any kind.....	10 cents

2. As to Stapleton: The City wants fifteen round trips a day, and more as the traffic may demand them; hours to be fixed by agreement between the operating company and the City.

The fares upon this ferry, for passengers, to be 8 cents for a single ticket, or 75 cents for ten tickets. For vehicles, etc., the same fares as to St. George.

3. As to Port Richmond: The City wants trips and fares on the same basis as to Stapleton.

BOATS

All boats in the present service to be replaced by new as rapidly as possible, except the "Robert Garrett" and the "Castleton", and these two to be rebuilt so as to provide as much headroom for teams as the Pennsylvania Railroad ferry boats on the North River give, and to be modernized in every respect. The old boats to be sold as soon as possible. All new boats to have a speed great enough to make twenty minutes to St. George the average running time in all weathers.

PROPOSED TERMS OF LEASE

In order to accomplish these results, the City will lease the ferry to a company representing both the Baltimore and Ohio and the trolleys equally, with the Dock Commissioner to represent the City, conditioned upon giving the service above outlined upon the following terms:

1. The City to construct suitable terminals at Stapleton and Port Richmond, and to improve the terminals at both St. George and Whitehall and adapt them for double-deck ferry boats, and to arrange the St. George terminal so as to give satisfactory accommodation to both railroads.

2. The City to make no charge, either for the ferry slips or for the franchise until payments on these accounts can be made out of the net earnings.

3. On the other hand, each railroad company to pay to the City one-half cent per passenger, both coming and going, for access to the ferry at St. George.

4. The company operating the ferry shall be an operating company only, its income and expenses to be balanced in the manner outlined below:

(A) The new boats needed are to be bought by the ferry company, and at the end of the lease, if the lease is not renewed, the City is to buy the boats at their then book value; boats that are retained by the ferry company for immediate use to be valued, and interest to be charged on the valuation by the operating company, together with a deterioration of . . per cent., to be marked off each year.

(B) The company operating the ferry to keep its books open at all times to inspection by the City and by both railroad companies. It shall be permitted to charge $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on all operating expenses as an operating commission to be divided equally between the two railroads. It shall charge this and all other actual expenses, including interest on bonds to be issued for cost of boats and a suitable sum for a sinking fund, for repairs to slips and terminals, for dredging, etc., to an "Income and Ex-

pense Account," to which also, it shall credit the earnings. All items of expense to be generally approved by both railroads and by the Dock Commissioner on behalf of the City.

(C) If at the end of the year there is a debit balance in the "Income and Expense Account", one-third of the amount may be deducted from the sum due the City on account of the payment of one-half cent per passenger from the two railroads; the remainder to be divided equally between the two roads. When there is a credit balance at the end of the year, said balance shall be used (a) to make good, pro rata, the losses that may have been shared by the two railroad companies and the sum that may have been deducted from the payment to the City of one-half cent per passenger; (b) to pay the City its customary charge for the ferry slips and its usual franchise tax; (c) as additional payment to the City against the risk it runs of receiving no return at all on account of slips or franchises.

On motion, the report was accepted and the matter referred back to the Dock Commissioner, in connection with the Mayor, for negotiation of a lease as nearly as possible on the lines indicated.

N. TAYLOR PHILLIPS, Secretary.

After several meetings and much negotiating between the Mayor and the two interested contestants for the Ferry Franchise, the Mayor said to me that he had come to the conclusion that I was right and that no satisfactory arrangement could be made with the Baltimore and Ohio and the Rogers interests, and that he was ready to stand for a City owned and operated Ferry—as Roosevelt would say, I was de-light-ed.

We then discussed the best way to proceed. The Mayor thought it best for him to take the matter up with the Controller as he was probably the strongest objector to the Municipal Ferry proposition, we would keep our own counsels, and for me to call again in a few days. To my delight the Mayor said after a long and serious discussion with Mr. Grout—he persuaded him it was his duty to support Richmond in its demand for a Municipal Ferry.

He told me he had an appointment with Mr. Fornes, Chairman of the Board of Aldermen, to go over the matter with him, and he expected there would be no serious opposition on the part of Fornes, and if everything went as he expected we could reasonably count on our City owned Ferry.

I called again in a few days and the Mayor assured me that in his judgment success was assured.

In due course of time it was concluded by the Board of Sinking Fund to take over the Old Ferry Boats and the terminals and to operate the Ferry along the lines of Mayor Low's report and thus the Municipal Ferry was launched.

BUILDING OF NEW FERRY BOATS

The Committee of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce then urged the building of new Ferry Boats, and the Board requested A. Cary Smith, a noted Naval Architect, who at that time was receiving favorable notice in the public press for what was called the splendid boats that Smith had planned for the N. Y. and Long Branch service. They were certainly splendid types, and are much admired to this day, as they plow the waters of the upper and lower bays on their way to the Highlands—Smith was so obsessed with the idea of perfection of these boats that he proposed to plan similar Boats for the Staten Island Ferry. These boats were what are known as single enders, with little or no accommodation for teams, and had to back out and turn around on leaving their slips and were practically unsuited for double deck loading and unloading.

Mr. Smith never deigned to discuss with me the merits of his single end boats for the Staten Island service, but once, and that was in answer to my assertion that it would be extra hazardous to turn around at the Battery in the very vortex of water craft activity—when he blurted out: "Rot, we are doing it every day". I returned: "Rot, you are not doing it every day—Rot, you are only turning half way round, and Rot, only a couple of times a day instead of every few minutes as will be necessary in the Staten Island Ferry service. Rot, in no such congestion as at the Battery—Rot, your proposed boats are entirely unsuited for the Staten Island Service for many reasons, and a little common sense would tell you so—good day". This was my last meeting with Mr. Smith. If he had taken a lesson from Franklin, who said: "Anybody can learn something from anybody else". I am not sure I am quoting poor Richard correctly—the meaning intended to be conveyed was that the learned can learn from plain people. The sum of human knowledge is so illimitable that after the Solomons and Solons and Cary Smiths had absorbed to their amplitude, there would be a large "left over" held in trust by just ordinary folks. Mr. Smith was so obsessed with his own importance that he resented any opposition to his propositions, he seemed to act as if it were impertinent for an outsider, not an Architect, to question his creations, and as the saying goes—"The King can do no wrong", so his highness, A Cary Smith could make no mistake—it was "*lese majestie*" to question the wisdom of his determinations—and of course, I was at great disadvantage in appealing to the Mayor—a Farmer and Real Estate owner to question a successful and renowned boat designer, an architect selected at the Mayor's instance, however, I persisted in my opposition and made some impression on the Mayor and Comptroller and held the matter up until vacation

time coming on gave some respite, and then the Elections following Mayor Low was defeated for re-election, and though he had about two months to act upon the Ferry matter, he, the good and fair man took the ground that the incoming administration having to shoulder the responsibility of building and running the Ferry should have the determination of the size and character of the Ferry Boats—and so we had to begin *de-novo*—with the new administration.

Realizing the great disadvantage as a rank outsider in treating with a professional overzealous of his calling and standing in his profession, I determined to steer clear of that mistake by seeking an ally of professional standing to add strength and emphasis to my position. In casting about for such aid, I was fortunate in thinking of Mr. Walter C. Kerr, resident in the Country Club Colony of Dongan Hills—I got in touch with Mr. Kerr at his New York office, stated to him my troubles and enlisted his aid. Mr. Kerr was from the first much interested, and soon became enthusiastic in the subject, and it did not take long to satisfy him that the single enders of the Long Branch Ferry type were not suitable or adapted to the service required on the Staten Island Ferry. Mr. Kerr was a member of engineering firm of Westinghouse, Church & Kerr—he had the advantage of large experience in general engineering and the prestige that came from membership in a distinguished engineering firm. We took the matter of the boats to the new administration with the result that A. Cary Smith was dropped as designer, and a new firm (Messrs. Millard and Maclean) was appointed—getting in touch with the new naval architects, Mr. Kerr was successful in satisfying them that the type of boat favored by Smith was entirely unsuited for our ferry and thus the most important point was won. We then set to work studying change and improvements in the boats that we thought necessary. First, we took up getting rid of the smoke, noise and disagreeableness that came to the upper saloon from the men's cabin and planned the stairways outside the cabin, thus eliminating the cabins from the upper saloon—as now in the new boats—so that today one sitting in the upper cabin, so far as any disagreeableness is concerned, one would not know a men's cabin existed.

Next we considered the ventilation of the lower cabins to get rid of the noxious air that came to the upper saloon, especially in the closed season, and those who remember the fetid, foul atmosphere that came up the stairway, vitiating the air in the upper saloon, can appreciate the great change. Next we considered increasing the height of the gang ways for teams, as per the recommendation in Mayor Low's report—also that the boats and docks should be arranged to receive and discharge passengers from both decks, as also recommended by Mayor Low.

Next we sought to improve the heating system. Cold and windy days the boats were very uncomfortable, and the old sliding windows made it very unpleasant in windy weather.

Next we asked that the bridges on the docks at both levels should be lengthened considerably, so as to make it easier for both passengers and teams, especially at high and low water. Other minor details as to seat arrangement were suggested. All of the recommendations were included in the plans and specifications, in fact, everything that we suggested, except additional horse power, Mr. Kerr deemed necessary to enable the boats to keep their schedule in very bad windy weather. Mr. Kerr did not insist upon this however. He said the architects were broad minded and always agreeable. Mr. Kerr had nothing but praise for the new naval architects, and hence today we have a highly satisfactory, if not the best ferry in the world. Much of this is due to Mr. Kerr, for his diplomatic manner and forceful and able presentation was largely responsible for our success. Mr. Kerr has passed away—gone to his reward—left a vacancy hard to fill—and the people of Staten Island, especially those who use the ferry should hold him in grateful remembrance.

TRANSFERS WITH THE INTERBOROUGH.

Thinking it very dubious about any help from a tunnel—I cast about for some other help for the transportation interests of our Islanders, and finally decided to try for transfers from our Municipal Ferry and the Interborough City lines. As a preliminary I had several men to count the passengers on the Ferry Boats, going to New York for different hours on different days and to count the number of such passengers taking the elevated lines, the subway, and the surface street lines, thus determining the number of those who walked, etc. I then informed myself as to the result of the commission hour travel and the Sunday concession of a 5 cent fare, and also the result of a straight 5 cents fare on the elevated lines. Thus prepared I sought an interview with Mr. Shonts, the President of the Interborough Lines. After stating the object of my visit, I gave him the result of my count of passengers, etc., and expressed to him my opinion judging from the experience of Jay Gould, who previously owned or dominated the elevated systems in New York, that it would be a good paying proposition for the Interborough to agree to transfers upon the basis of three cents to his Company and 2 cents to the City lines. He heard me with patience and then requested that I call again in about a week. In the meantime, he would check up the proposition and would be prepared to consider the matter more intelligently. I called at the time appointed, and Mr. Shonts said he had in connection with Mr. Hedley, the Vice-President, gone somewhat into the matter and could not see any

advantage of such an arrangement of transfers as I had proposed; that his lines all met the boats at South Ferry, and if any of our passengers wanted to go north they had to take his lines, and it did not seem good business to give up 2 cents per passenger unnecessarily. I had given him a synopsis of the benefits of the transfers with my reasons, which were balancing the traffic on his lines, and that he got more per resident in Richmond than from those of any other borough. I asked him if he had fully considered the balancing of the traffic on his lines, and he said that he had, and that they had concluded that the tunnel to Brooklyn which was under construction and the tunnels to New Jersey would balance the traffic. I told him I thought he was mistaken—that the tunnel to Brooklyn would only balance the traffic on the tunnel system and would not affect in the least, his elevated system, or his street level lines, and that as far as the New Jersey lines helping to balance the traffic, I thought upon mature reflection that they, upon the whole, would increase the unbalanced condition. I said the Courtlandt Street and the Morton Street tunnels probably would not affect it much one way or the other but that the Pennsylvania tunnel at 34th Street would affect the condition adversely, that a large majority of the passengers coming into the City most of them were for the down town sections and hence would crowd into cars already loaded going down in the morning thus very largely exaggerating the unbalanced condition—he made no answer. I told him the effect of the Commission hours and the cutting the rate to 5 cents by Gould, etc. I then asked him if he had considered the question that patrons on Staten Island were worth more to him than those from the other Boroughs, and he smiling said he had not. I told him that was a very, if not the most important feature of the whole subject. I asked him if he knew what proportion of the regular traffic that came to Manhattan from Brooklyn were patrons of his lines; he said that he did not. I told him that I had looked into that phase of the question. That I had taken the pains to ascertain at the different ferries and at the Brooklyn Bridge, and as near as I could determine not more than twenty-five per cent of the passengers reaching Manhattan from Brooklyn, took his north and south lines. I told him in connection with live, careful men we had at different hours in the day estimated as near as possible the passengers coming over the Brooklyn Bridge and found but few going down to the subway or up to the elevated lines and the great horde coming over the bridge walked directly to their places of business, and that was true of all the ferries, for I found the great mass coming to Manhattan took those lines in Brooklyn in connection with ferry taking them near their destination in Manhattan to save an extra fare, while if transfers were given as proposed, practically every pas-

senger coming to the City from Staten Island would take his lines, that all the passengers come to South Ferry, and all would take his lines, and that he would practically own the Staten Island traffic. And hence, on an average, every passenger coming to the City from Staten Island would be worth four or five from the other sections. He seemed dazed at this phase of the problem, and said he would like to look further into the matter, and asked me to call again in a week from that time. I did so and Mr. Shonts said that he believed that the transfers would be a good business proposition for his Company, and he would favor them, but that it was a matter for the Directors to decide, and that he would take it up with the Board. I considered this tantamount to a victory, as Mr. Shonts seemed to have his own way pretty generally in determining the general management of the Interborough Lines. I then took the matter up with the Mayor, arranged for an appointment with Mayor Gaynor, and in presenting the matter he was a good listener until I came to the proposed division of the 5 cents—3 cents to the Interborough and 2 cents to the City, when he in indignation spoke out, the City will not stand for that—that the ferry was now being run at a loss, and the best the City should be asked to do was an equal division of the nickle.

I told him that it was a victory to get the Interborough to agree to the proposed division, as there was no power to coerce the Company to give the transfers, and that they would get no other benefits except the money received while the City would get the increase in assessed values, and that it was no more than fair as Richmond was paying her share for all the increase transportation facilities to the other Boroughs—he turned and said that was true and he would approve of the division as proposed. I then thought it time to see Mr. Cromwell and acquaint him with what had happened—told him I was not in Politics and that I would turn the matter over to him, and he could have the honor and the prestige of the securing the transfers would bring—and I suggested that I arrange a meeting with Mr. Shonts, and I did so, and we went together to Mr. Shonts' office, and Mr. Shonts said what he had told me—that he deemed the transfers as proposed a good business proposition, but that the matter was one for the Directors to decide, and on leaving he requested me to send him a synopsis of the arguments I had used, to refresh his memory at the Board meeting—later I did this, and sent a copy to Mr. Cromwell, who was off on his vacation. Mr. Cromwell acknowledged the receipt and said it was most satisfactory, and that he would take up the matter on his return and push it through. Mr. Cromwell was one of the Committee, with Mr. McAneny, and Borough President Miller, of the Bronx, appointed by the Board to arrange with the Interborough the terms of the

dual subway contract. And my object was to get the transfers included in the contract. Mr. Cromwell returned and after a few weeks, not hearing from him, I called on him, and he said he had brought the matter up at one of their meetings and that McAneny, Chairman of the Committee, said it was not the psychological time, and that he had not further urged it then. I said to Mr. Cromwell, that the Committee, as I learned from the Press, was meeting every day, and he said yes, and the evening also, as they were anxious to get the matter settled. I said it seemed to be the psychological time for the other four Boroughs, and that I would not be put off in that way—I would let them know there was a man at the helm on Staten Island, and a lot more which it is unnecessary to repeat here. Suffice it to say that nothing was done; no mention of the transfers were put into the dual subway contract, and thus an opportunity to help his constituents seldom offered to any man was lost; practically allowed to go by default, as Shonts had virtually agreed to it, also the Mayor, and the Committee, who had expressed itself willing to aid Richmond but could not see its way clear, as it could not get a tenant to operate the tunnel extension as per the dual subway agreement at a 5 cents fare; but this would not require any security or the sale of any corporate stock, in fact no liability for the City, only the scratch of a pen—and to see it all fail after what I had done was exasperating in the extreme. I never received from Mr. Cromwell any explanation—and never knew what sinister power prevented the success of this move.

Mr. Cromwell, whom I had previously supported, was beaten in the race for re-election.

It is sometimes as necessary and important to oppose inconsiderate and unwise movements, as to foster and approve those desirable, and I have thought perhaps it would be interesting to note some of these.

Shortly before Consolidation, Mr. William A. Johnston, a most amiable, conscientious and worthy citizen, a member of the Chamber of Commerce thought a topographical map of Staten Island should be made, and offered a resolution at the meeting of the Chamber to that effect. The matter was discussed and it seemed the consensus of opinion that the Chamber favored the motion, I felt that any money spent for that purpose would be practically thrown away. I waited for some one else to raise an objection, as I disliked to be the first to enter protest to Mr. Johnston's motion, but as I deemed the matter too important to allow it to pass I protested against such action, and said the City would pay no notice to any map which we might make, and that it would be money thrown away, which was much needed for road improvements, as the City would recognize only its own topographical maps for its street layout and sewer system which

would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, and probably years to complete, the Chamber became satisfied, of the unwisdom of the movement, as it would complicate matters and divert money from the highway improvement and the Chamber could not afford to use its influence in that direction, the resolution was laid upon the table and nothing more ever came of it. Years afterward Mr. Johnston thanked me, for the part I had taken, as he had become convinced that it would have been a useless expenditure of money to put it into a survey which he was satisfied then the City would not adopt.

MOVE TO GET WATER FROM NEW JERSEY

After Consolidation, dissatisfaction with the water supply for Richmond became quite urgent. It was charged that the water supplied by the City was insufficient, dirty and so briny as to be entirely unfit for steam boiler purposes, as the salt in the water destroyed the pipes, boilers, etc., and these facts became known to a New Jersey Corporation, (whose Corporate name I cannot recall) engaged in various economical pursuits, especially the supplying of water to many of the towns in New Jersey. The said Corporation opened negotiations with the City to supply Richmond Borough with water.

I took the trouble to investigate the said Corporation and my opinion from what I learned, impressed me that it would be bad policy for the City to become entangled with the New Jersey Corporation—that the service rendered in New Jersey was not satisfactory. They would put mains only on streets well built up, where the service would immediately pay, and that in short it was a grasping, and selfish Company, in business strictly for its own pocket. The Company had many friends on Staten Island who favored arrangement by the City with the Company for a water supply, and a meeting was called by the Board of Estimate to consider the question.

Mr. Sidney F. Rawson was strenuously opposed to the proposition of the making of a contract with the New Jersey Corporation; and as I had often told Mr. Rawson, that I knew there was ample supply of water on Staten Island, he requested me to come to the meeting, and a very interesting, though somewhat acrimonious discussion, followed, those favorable to the Corporation taking the ground that no supply of any consequence could be had on Staten Island and that the only hope was with the New Jersey Company.

Some one present had a copy of an opinion by Professor Hallock of Columbia, that the water supply on Staten Island was very limited, as it was shut off from any water from New Jersey by a trap dike running through the Island into New Jersey, etc. I

heard all that was urged in favor of the New Jersey Corporation and then told the Board that I knew there was ample supply on Staten Island, and told them that I knew the opinion of Professor Hallock and that I took the pains to go to Dr. Hallock's home and discuss the matter with him. Dr. Hallock, on account of the trap dike said that he was satisfied that no considerable amount of water could come in through New Jersey. I asked him the size and direction of the trap dike and he replied that it was from the Palisades, dipped under Jersey City and Bayonne, cropping out at Graniteville, and again at Linoleumville, thence across the Sound and so on to Plainfield and beyond, that this was bed rock going to the bowels of the earth, was impervious to water, etc.

I told him so far I agreed with him, but what was to prevent the water coming into Staten Island from New Jersey through the Cretaceous formation, south of the tongue of trap rock or north of said tongue. He at once saw the force of the contention and admitted that the Cretaceous formation being particularly favorable for carrying water, that no doubt considerable water came into Staten Island from New Jersey. I also told the Board that the year before I had hired a large pump with seven inches discharge and a boiler and engine set up on my property between New Dorp and Grant City, and bored a well fifty feet deep near a brook to take off the water pumped, and that I had that pump going night and day for two weeks, with the result that I had made no appreciable lowering of the water in that area from test pipes driven 200 feet from the pump. I insisted that I knew there was ample supply, of good potable water on Staten Island and though not absolutely free from brackishness caused by some seeping from the sea, yet better and purer than that now being served to the people, and it would be wiser for the City to get its supply from that source to tide us over until such time as we could get water from the Catskills which I said was sure to come, than to become entangled with the New Jersey Corporation, the result was that the meeting adjourned without action, and immediately Mr. John E. Bowe, then Deputy Commissioner of Water Supply got busy—got in touch with Professor Halleck, and had him select places on the south side of the island for four pumping stations. Professor Halleck, to save City expense chose the line of Southfield Boulevard where City mains were and four pumping stations were installed and ample supply of water secured, and thus the City was saved from entering into a contract what might have proven expensive and injurious to the City, and probably retarding our connection with the Catskills, etc., and Richmond secured sufficient very good water, though not as soft as desirable until we finally got water from the Catskills via Brooklyn.

TRYING TO STEAL SLIP.

A villainous attempt to steal the use of one of the two piers at Whitehall, South Ferry for the use of what was called the "Blue Line" of the Jersey Central Railroad. A meeting was called by McDougal Hawks, Dock Commissioner, at his office, Pier 1, North River, to consider the question. The New Jersey Central Railroad was represented by Mr. Boardman, a member of the firm of Tracy, Boardman & Platt. Mr. Platt was a son of Thomas Platt, the Republican leader in the State. There was a large meeting as this was very important to Staten Island as there were only two piers at South Ferry available for the Staten Island service. The meeting was opened by the Dock Commissioner who stated the object of the meeting, etc.

Then Mr. Boardman, in high feather, told the meeting in a very patronizing way the leasing of the pier would not injure the Island service, and a lot of platitudes unworthy of a lawyer occupying a respectable position in the profession, until Mr. Howard R. Bayne, asked for an explanation how it came that the counsel for the Staten Island Rapid Transit, should be here advocating the leasing of this pier to the Jersey Central which seemingly would injure the Staten Island Rapid Transit. When Mr. Boardman replied, the gentleman (meaning Mr. Bayne) was mistaken that he was not and had not been counsel for the Staten Island Rapid Transit for over two years. It then occurred to me that I had noticed in the Press that Mr. Boardman's firm had been retained by the Rapid Transit Commission to look after the interest of the City in matters affecting the activities of that commission, so I asked Mr. Boardman if he was counsel for the Rapid Transit Commission—he said that he was—I asked him if he had been retained, he said that he had—I said this was astonishing—that the Rapid Transit Commission as I understood it, was organized by the Legislature, to give better transit facilities between the various Boroughs of the greater City, of which Richmond is one, and that I had supposed that it was not only the duty of the Commissioners and of the engineers, and lawyers as well to aid and abet in every possible way better transit facilities between the various Boroughs, and I could not understand the ethics of professional propriety that would *justify our lawyer* with our money in his pocket, coming here as the paid attorney for a foreign corporation and stab the Borough of Richmond in its very vitals on this important question of transit facilities.

This seemed a knockout blow, for Boardman never got on his feet again, made no response, the meeting was adjourned, and nothing more was ever heard of this monstrous outrage of taking from the use of Staten Island Ferry one of the two slips which had been in the use of that ferry from time immemorial.

PROPOSAL TO BUILD A SUBWAY TO STATEN ISLAND VIA NEW JERSEY

A committee of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and the Civic League proposed the novel achievement of building a direct tunnel from Manhattan to St. George by way of detour to New Jersey. The members of this committee was composed of leading and influential citizens whose commanding position was such, that many needed no other guarantee of the wisdom of their proposition than their endorsement. A public meeting was called at the Borough Hall with much flourish and much advertisement by circulars and leaflets, and a large meeting was the result. I had not, on account of my health, attended former meetings on this subject, but one of the circulars with map of route, etc., fell into my hands. After perusing this propaganda I deemed it my duty to attend and oppose the novel, if not preposterous proposition. The meeting was somewhat beligerent, but the outcome was that no action was taken and nothing more was ever heard of this novel proposition of building a direct subway from Manhattan to St. George, Staten Island via New Jersey. The following letter written at the time at the request of the Staten Island Advance will give better understanding of the pro and con of this controversy than anything I could now write. To the Editor of the Daily Advance:

Connection of Richmond by tunnel with other boroughs is of great importance. Conditions now seem favorable for this desirable consummation. Unfortunately, in my judgment a most injudicious and unwarranted position has been taken by the committee acting supposedly in the interest of Richmond. They (the committee) have planned and recommended two routes, both of which are almost entirely in the State of New Jersey, where the City has no authority to build or even spend its money to survey a route; also this committee by propaganda has taken strong ground against the route which has been considered desirable for all the years since the organization of the old Rapid Transit Commission, and has been presented and urged at all meetings both of the Rapid Transit Commission, the Public Service Commission and the Board of Estimate, by the Chamber of Commerce and leading citizens generally.

Not content with favoring two impossible routes, but by propaganda in public press and by leaflet with map and sketches, state

that the people of Richmond were unanimously in favor of the two routes, and were unanimously against the Bay Ridge route, both of these statements were absolutely false, and the leaflet circulated ostensibly by the committee containing many false statements, in order to support and aid this outrageous deception.

On account of my health I had not attended public meetings lately, but when I received this leaflet honey-combed with false and misleading statements, I deemed it my duty to go to the meeting and denounce the outrage. As a Staten Islander I could not stand to be put in such a false, foolish and unjust position. I considered it an impeachment of my manhood and an insult to my intelligence.

The Bay Ridge route has been for all the long years the one route urged as feasible and possible until these new and enterprising financiers whose horoscope is so wonderful and the prospect so alluring that one would think they only had to strike a rock Moses-like and a golden stream would gush forth. They talk of millions with a fluency and eclat that would be becoming to Morgan or Rockefeller.

The relative value of the several routes, with the prospect of securing them, is what interest Staten Islanders. First, what obstacles, if any, are in the way of securing any route? Secondly, if secured, which would be best for Richmond, and the City? Thirdly, which is the most likely to be secured.

The two routes advocated by the committee, being mostly in New Jersey I will call them New Jersey routes. Route A starts from Tompkinsville, passes St. George under the hill and Kill von Kull with slight detour to the northern side of Ellis Island, thence under the North River to the Battery, with no connection and an extra fare—for by no stretch of reason or imagination could this route, in another State, never contemplated, be considered an extension of either the dual subway systems, and by any process of reasoning could we expect these or other lines to grant free transfers.

Route B passes through the oil tank region of Constable Hook, thence along the bulkhead line of the extensive freight yards of two trunk line railroads with no prospect of passengers except from Staten Island and Constable Hook section, and depending upon the Central Railroad of New Jersey to furnish the passengers from New Jersey to justify the cost, thence by tunnel to the Battery without connection, same as Route A.

The few passengers from Staten Island and Constable Hook would not be sufficient to warrant going through the tunnel to the Battery without change, hence this would be only a shuttle connection with the Jersey Central. And the great flourish of connection with five railroads dwindles to connection with the freight yards of two and the passenger system of one. It gives

no better connection with the Baltimore & Ohio than we have now.

These two routes, being mostly in New Jersey, would not only require legislation in both States, but passing most of the way over private property would require the securing of the right of way over same, which would be long and tedious negotiations, hence long delays before such routes would be available.

The "right of way" via Bay Ridge connecting with the dual subway system is clear, unobstructed and indisputable.

The connection with the dual subway system means connections southerly with Coney Island, Bay Ridge, yacht and athletic clubs, Prospect Park and places on connecting lines of the system. Easterly and northerly along near the waterfront, now rapidly improving, including the famous Bush Terminal region, to Atlantic Avenue, connecting with many systems throughout Brooklyn and Long Island, Borough Hall, Court House, Post Office, City Offices, the hotel, department stores and theatre sections, by local trains to the Municipal Building, Manhattan, and by express to Canal Street and up Broadway to Union Square, passing through the wholesale dry goods district, thence up Broadway and Seventh Avenue to the Pennsylvania Railroad depot (and by free transfers to the Grand Central Station), thence to Forty-second Street and Times Square, thence to Fifty-ninth Street and Central Park to the hotel, theatre and automobile centers, thence along Fifty-ninth Street and Central Park to Queensborough Bridge (or by tunnel) to Queens, and up Roosevelt Avenue. Also by change at Pacific Street, Brooklyn, taking the tunnel (which is nearly completed) to Whitehall Street to the Post Office, Custom House and Produce Exchange, up through Church Street, to Rector, Courtlandt Street at the Hudson Tunnels, thence to Broadway at City Hall, thence to Canal Street and so on up Broadway. Again, when the route from Whitehall Street through Broad and Nassau Streets is finished you will go through the heart of the financial district and insurance district, with stations at Broad and Wall Streets, at the sub-treasury and the Stock Exchange, and within easy reach of the Consolidated and Cotton Exchanges, and on through Nassau Street to Park Row, to Post Office and Municipal Building, passing through the great newspaper section, thence through Centre and McDougal Streets to Williamsburg Bridge and over into Queens and up Broadway. Also connecting with the numerous lines of the system; all at a single fare, at present 5 cents.

The time which it will take over this system from Tompkinsville is easily determined, by adding five minutes to 59th Street, Brooklyn from there by local to the Municipal Building, Manhattan, 22 minutes by express to Canal Street, 14 to 15 minutes

and to Union Square 19 minutes and to 42nd Street, 23 to 24 minutes—and from Union Square to Whitehall Street, 10 minutes.

The express is not running above Union Square and the road is not running above 42nd Street.

This is the Big Elephant, the enterprising committee were afraid they would have on their hands in the Bay Ridge route. Well it looks like a good large, healthy and useful specimen, compared to the weak stunted, mongrel specimen of the committee which has no reason for its existence, and of which its own progenitors will be ashamed.

I understand the projectors of the two New Jersey routes, expect, or rather say they expect, to connect with the Interborough at Bowling Green. This is inconceivable. To cross the whole northern side of Battery Park from the river near Pier A to connection near Bowling Green is simply ridiculous. It would be a perpetual barrier for all future tunnels from South Brooklyn and Staten Island through the park up through Manhattan. New York, through a great city, is still in its infancy. Within 30 or 40 years all tunnels must be duplicated or at least their carrying capacity doubled; the Battery is the natural entrance to Manhattan by tunnel from South Brooklyn and Staten Island. A tunnel across the north side of Battery Park would effectively preclude any future tunnel from the south to and through Manhattan. Nothing that could be devised would be a greater permanent injury to South Brooklyn and Staten Island.

Staten Island and South Brooklyn in the years to come will need many subways to Manhattan, and the Battery should be reserved exclusively for them, and the Central of New Jersey should do as McAdoo did, buy a terminal in the city, and not try to use Staten Island to get an entrance via the Battery.

For many a long year (in my judgment) the only hope for Staten Island for connection through the other Boroughs for a 5 cent fare on the same basis as the other Boroughs, is by way of Brooklyn, connecting with the dual system.

If it were possible to induce the city to make the great outlay for a direct route there are three routes which should be considered—one from Battery Park to and along Governors Island to Tompkinsville, passing the Bell Buoy for ventilating shaft. Second from Battery Park under Governors' Island to Red Hook, Brooklyn, thence to Tompkinsville via Bell Buoy. Third (all things considered, I consider best) Battery Park to Hamilton Avenue, Brooklyn and up that avenue to Van Brunt Street and down that street to Red Hook, thence to Tompkinsville via Bell Buoy.

This latter route would be a little shorter than the committee's route A. Would give about three stations in Brooklyn in a sec-

tion much in need of rapid transit and easily connected with the Dual System, would give much business to help pay for the great outlay, and would appeal to the city authorities hence I believe this is the only direct or nearly direct route possible at this time. In the years to come, when our population is much larger, or great railroad and shipping terminals demand it, then we can consistently ask for a direct tunnel. A little business sense is worth more for the attainment of this object, than great volume of wishy washy pretence or flambuoyant declamation.

Some of our most estimable and worthy citizens oppose the tunnel for what might be termed esthetic reasons. They deprecate the ruthless hand of man in despoiling our beautiful Island. I truly sympathize with them. I appreciate their honest sentiments. I, too, love the country, the "orchard, the meadow and the deep tangled wild wood," have their wooing charms, but we are in the greatest city of the continent, progressing at a prodigious rate, its momentum cannot be stopped, and Richmond is destined to be the greatest shipping and railroad terminal on the continent. The contest for the markets of the world, and our coming again into active participation in the carrying trade will perforce of inexorable economic laws demand that the make-shifts of the past shall make way for the best possible terminals for handling both freight and passengers. Staten Island's waterfront (according to most competent authority), is not only the best in the harbor of New York, but "the eastern coast of the United States does not offer a site its equal" it is also the only place in the harbor where all the railroads can "meet the tonnage of the world" with ample room for all necessary auxiliaries. Given these conditions, it does not need a prophet to forecast the outcome.

The corollary of these conditions means great warehouse and manufacturing centers. All this may come sooner than expected for economic pressure will impel at a tremendous rate. Other nations are alive to the situation; the contest for the markets of the world is on, it will be a war to the finish with the survival of the fittest. To oppose would be folly—it is wisdom to accept the inevitable.

Those who take the position of a direct tunnel or none, are so far from the pale of reason, that words would be lost, to such I would say "Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone."

The committee has made mistakes. We all make mistakes. It is human to err. Putting our differences behind us. Let us then, man fashion, "all together" pull a good stroke for a tunnel.

Dongan Hills, April 10, 1919.

D. J. TYSEN.

TUNNEL TO STATEN ISLAND VIA BROOKLYN

Many meetings on Staten Island and before the Rapid Transit Commission for tunnel connection with the other Boroughs have been held during all the years since consolidation with redundancy of argument and volume of rhetoric with no appreciable success, until the advent of the present administration, since which progress has been made and hope heartens us that in the near future we will realize this much desired consummation. Nothing more remains to be said at this time—my views on this subject will be best given by the following letter to the Rapid Transit Commission :

The Public Service Commission,
154 Nassau Street,
New York City.

Gentlemen :

Transit facilities and interborough communication are most important questions affecting the interest of the great City. Lower Manhattan being the business and financial centre—is the Mecca to which all routes must lead. Populations of cities flow along the lines of least resistance; transit facilities largely control the trend of population. Ten miles south by tunnel can be made as quickly as the same distance can be made in any other direction.

The present traffic of the north and south lines in Manhattan is lopsided—unbalanced. To balance this traffic and increase the earnings of these lines is of the greatest importance.

North of Canal Street in Manhattan and the Bronx there are now upwards of two millions of people; they are—we will assume—reasonably well accommodated by the existing north and south lines in Manhattan, two millions more in South Brooklyn and Staten Island would be equally as well accommodated by the same lines, with the same equipment, with little or no extra cost; while two millions more to the north will require the expenditure of at least one hundred and fifty million dollars in Manhattan to accommodate them.

As many fares would come to the lines of Manhattan per capita from those south as from those north, and the average haul would be shorter. Double the earnings of the north and

south lines in Manhattan and save this large expenditure by building the Fourth Avenue and Staten Island tunnel. The tunnels to New Jersey and those leading out to Long Island will help in balancing this traffic, but not to the extent that the tunnel to Staten Island via South Brooklyn would. Besides, the former benefit more particularly sections outside the city.

The commercial supremacy of this city is of the first importance. Excessive lighterage charges and lack of dock and pier accommodation have driven shipping trade to other ports and our ocean steamers to dock in New Jersey. If we would retain our commercial supremacy, better pier, dock and shipping facilities must be provided.

The United States Government has refused to allow piers to be further extended into the Hudson. The piers in Manhattan on either side are too short to accommodate ships now in sight, and much larger ships doubtless will follow. Where can you look for accommodation for these except to Staten Island? Here you can have piers of ample length, with ample depth of water, and ample room for vessels of the largest size to warp into dock without inconvenience or extra expense. Often stress of weather, fog or ice, compels vessels to lie at Quarantine over night; docking at Clifton would obviate this, and with proper tunnel facilities, passengers could reach their homes within the city long before they could dock at Hoboken on the Chelsea section under the most favorable circumstances.

Staten Island has more waterfront than any of the other Boroughs, and more that is unimproved than all the other Boroughs combined. When the barge and coast canals are completed, the Kill von Kull and Staten Island Sound, approximately about twenty miles in length, will be one of the greatest freight routes in the world. Manufacturing establishments have been forced to leave Manhattan and Brooklyn owing to high taxes and excessive cost in handling their products. This twenty miles of waterway will offer to such interests the most desirable factory and storehouse sites possible. With tunnel connection with Manhattan, subsidiary lines would soon make these available. From Mariners' Harbor to Clifton, about ten miles, a double track trunk railroad skirts the shore making direct connection possible with all piers and warehouses on the waterfront. Here you have the solution and guarantee of commercial supremacy. No other sections in the greater city, can offer you as much. Here the outgoing and incoming freight, as well as passengers, can be handled at the least possible cost, and, as has been aptly said: "The products of a continent meet the tonnage of the world." Should our ocean steamers be forced to dock in New Jersey and our carrying trade be forced to seek other ports, when with proper tunnel connections we have the very best conditions

for both services within our own borders? A tunnel to bring the Custom House, the Produce Exchange and the business and financial centres within easy reach of this most valuable waterfront will be to the city a valuable asset and security.

The late Austin Corbin's dream of a great passenger and freight terminal at the east end of Long Island may prove a veritable nightmare to this Metropolis if our city fathers sleep until the great Pennsylvania Railroad makes another Newport News, about as far eastward as Philadelphia is southward, and our city may be made, to some extent, a way station. It is not wise to belittle the consequences of this proposition; many able men deem it feasible. The tunnel to Staten Island, the Staten Island waterfront, and the Ambrose Channel are the potent factors to ward off this threatening blow. The Battery is the front door to Manhattan, all other entrances are side doors. From the Battery you may go, practically, to any part of Manhattan without changing; other entrances are largely local, requiring changes to reach other sections. The Battery also presents the most favorable conditions for the city to build tunnels and terminals, without cost for fee or easement, and without detriment to the park.

Manhattan has nearly reached its maximum population. In the near future, it will decrease in numbers, each year probably at an increased ratio, demands for business purposes driving many to seek new homes. Those bordering on the business section must soon shift. Where shall they go? The Bronx is practically out of their reach, owing to high land values. This will soon be true of Brooklyn and Queens. If you would keep them within the city. Staten Island is the only hope. There you have as fair a land as the sun shines on, and the health reports show it to be among the most healthful, the lines of drainage are short and the grades ample, and natural conditions made this a veritable land of promise to the home seeker, just across the Bay from Manhattan, and just across the narrow water way from what will soon be the most populous of the Boroughs, by tunnel ten to fifteen minutes from the business and financial centres via the front door at the Battery.

Business centres shift with the trend of population, the great business quarter of the city—lower Manhattan—represents vast realty value. This is practically at one side of the present population. Continued growth northward and not southward exaggerates this condition, and under this condition what guarantee of value is there in realty in lower Manhattan? There is no sure guarantee in values in lower Manhattan except a population to the south to centralize the business and financial sections; a small per cent of depreciation in property below City Hall would build many tunnels to Staten Island, and all New York is interested in maintaining values in lower Manhattan.

There has been much comment lately in the press as to the ability of the routes selected by your Board, viz.: the Lexington and Fourth Avenue tunnels, to pay.

The expenditure of public money where resultant benefits are unequal, and especially where deficit is probable, has led to much controversy in the past and has been the bugbear and scarecrow standing across the path of progress since the foundation of government by taxation. Happily, however, the evolution of progress tends to more liberal views. I will illustrate by a few examples.

For fifty years or more the battle for public schools was stubbornly contested in this State. Those having no children and those who preferred to educate their children in private schools, and the non-resident taxpayers, rebelled against the proposition that they must go down into their pockets and assist in the education of their neighbors' children—as well ask to help feed and clothe them. It was also contended that public operation would lead to corruption, be expensive and less efficient, and would be controlled largely by political favoritism. The fifty years or more of trial has proven the fallacy of all those fears. Wiser and more liberal views finally prevailed, and the "boarding round" and the "rate bill" became matters of history and now the proudest monument that breaks the sky in all the land is the dome and gable of the public school, yet it is all deficit, all on one side of the ledger, and no "revenue," no return, except better equipped citizenship. This marked a long step along the path of progress and civilization.

So with the public highways. Sixty years ago in "all the region round about" there was not, outside of the cities, a public highway improved by general taxation. Every improved pike, plank or macadam road was controlled by private capital; the toll gate was in evidence everywhere, and those who used the road paid, and those who didn't use didn't pay, and when it was proposed to build improved roadways by general taxation there was general rebellion. The vast majority who had no horses insisted it was robbery to compel them to pay for costly roadways for others' use. Here also wiser and more liberal views finally prevailed, and today state vies with state, county with county, and town with town, in building improved highways by taxation and the toll gate is of the past. And we are all happy, notwithstanding it is all deficit, no "revenue," all on one side of the ledger.

The postal service presents a striking example of the progress made in this direction. For many years after "Independence" graded rates of postage obtained. Every year there was a deficit, and in every Congress debate and contention arose as to the rates. Those, if I remember rightly, ranged from four to thirty cents. Much of the deficit was occasioned in the South, and the

Middle and Eastern States rebelled against paying it. This led to acrimonious debate, partaking somewhat of a sectional character; the Northern States insisting that every section should pay rates somewhat commensurate with the cost. Here also in the evolution of progress a more liberal policy prevailed and a uniform rate was finally adopted, and it now costs no more to send a letter across the Continent than across the street. This marked another step along the path of progress and civilization and though the deficit is yearly present, it goes into the budget without protest.

The history of our bridges presents another example of growth, of liberal and progressive sentiment. When the two cities decided to build the "Brooklyn Bridge" the solicitude was general as to how to make the bridge pay. Once built, the anxiety to have it pay was soon lost in the solicitude to have it accommodate the public. It never paid, never will pay, it is almost free and finally will be free. And so when the second bridge is built no one expects it to pay, and so with the third, etc. Sentiment has changed. These will all ultimately be free, and you can no more stop this result than you could change the tides of the ocean or the laws of gravity. Public sentiment will soon come to regard the ferries and tunnels from the same standpoint, notwithstanding this ghost of Banquo "Deficit" rises ever and anon to intimidate the weak and timid.

I would not have it inferred that I favor free transit by ferries or tunnels any more than I do free postage, but that the City Government should direct its efforts toward a uniform rate of fare within the limits of the City.

We can see no difference in principle whether the City's money shall be used to build a bridge over the water, a ferry on the water, or a tunnel under the water for interborough communication, and the public must come to take a like view of this matter. Revolutions are never backward. To justify the position that the ferries and tunnels operated by the City must pay, is going back to the dead past, to the "boarding round," the "rate bill," the "toll gate" the "graded postal rates," and to be consistent we must insist that the bridge, the recreation piers, the parkways, and the expensive speedway, costing many millions for a favored few, must pay. This is impossible; you cannot go backward.

If, however, your Board should deem it necessary that "revenue" shall be a dominant factor in determining tunnel routes, we would point to our long stretch of sandy beaches, within easy reach of the dense population of the city, where the toiling millions may find amusement and recreation by the sea. This would be a great source of revenue. The largely increased population of Richmond and the very considerable numbers in the neigh-

boring cities and villages of New Jersey who would find this tunnel a short and convenient way to Coney Island and other places of amusement and recreation in Brooklyn and Queens, would doubtless add many fares to the tunnel receipts; also the connection of these sections with the great and growing Borough of Brooklyn, from a business viewpoint, would lead to much travel via this tunnel; it would make possible a short route to the numerous towns and citizens along the Jersey coast, and would give them a short and popular route to Manhattan, via the front door at the Battery, leading to any part without change. This would also largely augment the earnings. And finally the revenue that would accrue to the City from increased assessments, would soon recoup the City for the whole outlay.

We are especially pleased to note the change made by you in the size of the Fourth Avenue tunnel to admit the larger cars of the suburban roads. It assures us of your appreciation of the demands of the future.

We deem it fortunate that a body so admirably constituted as your Board to intelligently solve the complex problem involved in the City's transit facilities and interborough connection, has been provided; and we are confident that consistent and comprehensive consideration will satisfy your Board that the City cannot afford to delay the building of the Staten Island tunnel, and that when finished, all things considered, it will be to the City, proportionate to its cost, the most valuable tunnel that will ever be built within its borders.

Respectfully submitted,

D. J. TYSEN.

Dongan Hills, June 20th, 1908.

Since this letter was written, the Secretary of War, in order to meet an emergency, has consented to a conditional, temporary extension of some piers in the Chelsea section. The increasing water traffic and the increasing size of ocean steamers will surely demand a change to some other section in the near future.

GARBAGE PLANT

The outrageous attempt to instal a garbage rendering plant for the whole City on Staten Island, and the specious reasons, and the insolence and unwarranted action of Mayor Mitchel are a dirty chapter in the History of Mitchel's Administration.

Mitchel, who had much natural ability, and considerable experience in City affairs, commanded the respect and esteem of his constituents, but his treatment and the reasons, or want of reasons for his action in this matter deserves the severest censure.

The impelling motive was generally attributed to his friendship for Ex-Senator Reynolds, who it is supposed, desired for selfish reasons to get rid of the Garbage Plant on Barren Island.

"Friendship rarest gem on earth,"

"Who ere hath found the jewel his."

Is a most charming, alluring and noble attribute—but no friendship, however pure and unalloyed, justifies a high official to violate the spirit of his oath of office or immunes him from censure for insulting a delegation of thousands of his constituents, when assembled at a meeting, over which he presided, by his insolent disrespect and insulting manner. He has gone to his reward. His friend was indicted for alleged infraction of the law while acting as Mayor of Long Beach. Under this indictment he was tried before Judge Cropsey of the Supreme Court and convicted. An appeal is now pending for reversal of judgment of conviction.

It remained for Mayor Hylan, whose sense of right and justice paved the way, and to Health Commissioner Dr. Copeland (now U. S. Senator) with the sense of justice and courage, and professional ability to declare the plant a nuisance, and abate it—and to District Attorney Fach for his energy and ability in calling meetings and securing the facts and assembling the testimony into shape, to justify the action of the Health Officer.

In handling you the enclosed plain statements "Unvarnished tale" I wish to say there is no pretense that various statements are the verbatim expression of the various persons named as such would be impossible as all happened 15 to 30 years ago. But the essential facts and conclusions are correct as stated. There may also be some discrepancy in the order of the happenings. Doubtless it will seem very tame at this date and without the smoke and fire—grape and shrapnel incidental to a wordy conflict.

During the time of the consideration of all these important subjects the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce exerted a great and wholesome influence in promoting the best interest of the Borough of Richmond, and much credit for this is due to Mr. Kolff, the energetic, tactful and resourceful Secretary of the Chamber for many years.

I hope this will prove measurably satisfactory, if not wholly, and that it may be the source of some pleasure to the idle curious as well as of some service to the more serious minded to learn the history of important happenings on Staten Island shortly be-

fore and after she changed from a beautiful rural suburb to an important integral part of a great Cosmopolitan City. We still had the same soil beneath our feet, the same range of grand hills, "whose lofty peaks proudly propped the sky" and the same blue ethereal overhead, but at the stroke of 12 o'clock midnight on December 31st, 1897, our government was radically changed, this was resented by some, as they thought it inimical to the best interests of the island. Happily this feeling has long since passed away.

This story exemplifies the truth of the saying—Eternal vigilance is the price of victory—also of success.

And now one word to my fellow citizens—by the inexorable law of Nature I am relegated to a back seat—out of commission; but to you who are vigorous in mind and body, there is a responsibility which, as public spirited citizens, you should assume. There is always something happening in a large city that needs public attention. The Mayor or President of the Borough cannot see everything. Their thoughts are centered on the thousand and one things demanding immediate attention, something deserving and important, some premature and some impossible. You should assist them. Partisanship should play no part.

There is at this time an important question that should receive your attention. The Borough of Richmond is militated against in its ferry facilities. The outrageous position is taken that our ferry should pay interest on initial cost, upkeep and operation. No other of the interborough connections are expected to pay, but we are continually reminded that our ferry does not pay and this is frequently urged when other improvements are sought, but nothing is ever said about facilities of the other boroughs. These are a city charge and Richmond pays its share as well as the other boroughs but when it comes to our ferry, forsooth, that is different. Here the ferry tolls for passengers and teams must pay the whole bill, interest on initial cost, upkeep and operating expenses, etc. This is an outrage. This is a city matter and it is justly a city charge. No different in principal from the bridges and tunnels in which the city has invested hundreds of millions of dollars and of which Richmond pays her share. These are practically free, treated as streets for interborough connection, and our ferry by the same token should also be practically free. This, however, we do not ask since that policy would defeat the object and purposes of the ferry, which is to furnish the people of Staten Island connection with the other boroughs. The Staten Island ferry being a long ride, and especially in the warm weather a delightful ride, would soon become a free excursion to many of the millions of the city—some would doubtless spend most of the day on the boats if they were free of cost to them—but some reasonable arrangement of

fares should be made to insure a rate satisfactory to Staten Islanders. Perhaps the regular fare should remain as it is, but a commutation rate by month or quarter, a mere nominal cost for passengers and teams.

This, with a Mayor just and equitable, who has shown during his whole term a disposition to do the right thing by the island and a Borough President always on the job, never sleeping on his post, never letting the grass grow under his feet. This accomplishment should be easy. So get alongside of the Mayor and Borough President and push this to success. Don't undertake it unless you intend to go to the end—remember the horse that quits on the homestretch never wins—also that defeat only makes it harder for any subsequent attempt. Once embarked, take the lead, give the word "Forward" and remember the fate of Lot's wife and never look back.

Respectfully,

DAVID J. TYSEN.

October 16, 1924.

